



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0962MI-1 for Wyoming Public Schools

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	6
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant has articulated a comprehensive vision by describing its reform project CARPE DIEM (College Attainment and Readiness through Personalized Education, Dynamic Interventions, and Effective Management) it plans to implement through a consortium of four districts.</p> <p>Although the applicant provides a credible approach to the goals it has set to accelerate student achievement, specifically among its high-need students, the applicant did not build on the work it has done in thee four core assurance areas. The applicant provided evidence of the work it has done in three of the four core assurance areas but did not describe or provide evidence on what it has one to turn around its lowest achieving schools.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	6
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant's approach in selecting its participating schools was based on geographic selection and shared needs between the districts participating in the consortium and indicated that there was buy in by all the schools selected.</p> <p>The applicant provided a clear description on how the participating schools were selected and the number of students to be served providing evidence of a high quality LEA-level and school-level implementation of its project.</p> <p>However, the applicant was not clear on the breakdown of the number of students who are high-need in the chart provided indicating the type of participating student.</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	5
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provides a reform proposal and lists outcome goals but does not provide sufficient evidence to indicate how the reform proposal will be scaled up and translated to meaningful reform to support district-wide change in the districts participating in the consortium.</p> <p>The applicant does not describe the process of getting from the activities proposed to the outcomes listed. Based on these factors the applicant has provided insufficient evidene that shows it has implemented a high quality plan.</p>		
(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The charts included by the applicant provide in detail the applicant's plan and vision that will likely result in improving student learning and performance.</p> <p>The charts provided by the applicant clearly identified ambitious yet achievable goals and provided realistic targets for its subgroups which will result in improved student learning in the grade levels it has targeted through its CARPE DIEM project.</p> <p>The charts provided by the applicant include goals that address summative assessment performance through the use of assessments such as ACT and the applicant has provided data on its graduation rates,college enrollment rates and post secondary attainment goals to support its vision of improving student learning.</p>		

B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	5
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant did not provide sufficient evidence of advancing student learning and achievement because the applicant only provided three years of data, thus a clear record of success in advancing student learning was not established.</p> <p>The applicant was vague in describing what it has done to improve student learning outcomes and close the achievement gap.</p> <p>The applicant did provide clear evidence in reforming its lowest-achieving schools by identifying programs and strategies used broken down by the schools participating in the project and representative of each district in the consortium.</p> <p>The applicant was vague in how it will make data available to stakeholders to assist in improving student outcome.</p>		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	5
<p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant has demonstrated a high level of transparency regarding expenditures and salary information based on the state requirement that LEAs annually submit the LEA Finance Survey and post it on its website and the requirement by the state that LEAs post on their websites budgets approved within thirty days of approval by its board.</p>		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	10
<p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant demonstrated that it has sufficient autonomy under state mandated reform requirements to implement personalized learning environments through its CARPE DIEM project.</p> <p>The applicant provided a detailed description of the process it will use to implement personalized learning that complements the requirements mandated by the state.</p>		
(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	7
<p>(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provided evidence of the extent it went to meaningfully engage key stakeholders by creating county-wide teams that were engaged throughout the development of the application, and the creation of leadership teams within each school-site that reviewed the application.</p> <p>The applicant was vague in describing how the proposal was revised based on the input it received from its stakeholders.</p> <p>Clear evidence was provided of stakeholders support through the letters of support the applicant provided.</p>		
(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	5
<p>(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant presented a high quality plan to analyze how it will implement its project to provide personalized learning. Through charts provided in the application, the applicant described the achievement gaps, as well as corresponding poverty levels, racial distribution and homelessness of the students within the districts participating in the consortium.</p>		

C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	15
<p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant has provided evidence of a high-quality plan for improving learning by describing various approaches it will use</p>		

including exposure to technology by students, in particular high-need students to prepare them for college and career.

The applicant describes various programs including Project based learning, technology programs, renaissance learning and flip classroom instruction that are age appropriate which it will make available to its students in order to help them succeed.

Through web-based integrated educational assessments such as EXPLORE, PLAN, and ACT, educational supplements, and a student portfolio system, the applicant has described some of the approaches it will utilize to support students in understanding what they are learning, identify and develop goals to be college and career ready and master critical content. However, the applicant does not describe how exposure to diverse cultures through global technology will deepen individual learning.

The applicant has articulated a strategy to ensure students have access to instructional content through a personal treatment plan created every Fall, and educators use various instructional approaches such as blended learning and learner-based performance targets. The applicant provides for ongoing feedback through IGOR which supports state assessment data that can be sorted in various ways to assist in personalized learning recommendations and will assist in assessing the intervention tools needed for its high-need students.

The applicant describes the support it will provide to students to ensure that they are on track to manage their learning by providing orientations, demonstrations and a dashboard.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	15
---	----	----

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant described in detail the professional development and training teachers and principals will receive throughout the grant period. That professional development will support teachers in improving student learning and assist students as to progress to be college and career ready.

The applicant describes using the College Accelerated Network to assist with professional development and executive leadership coaching that will assist to implement strategies to support student's personalized learning in preparing for college and career. Teachers will be assisted in adapting content and instruction, measuring student progress and provided feedback to improve their effectiveness through the use of four core services: leadership, assessment, partnerships and intervention.

The applicant identified the challenge it may have with offering professional development after school to teachers that are part of a contract.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	10

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has provided evidence that practices, policies, and rules are in place to facilitate personalized learning. The applicant identified the district within the consortium that will take the lead in providing guidance to its leadership teams.

Although the applicant will place staff at each participating site, the applicant did not provide evidence that sufficient autonomy and flexibility will be provided to these staff members to make decisions over items such as schedules and personnel.

The applicant indicated that seat time waivers have been obtained to assist students to progress at their own pace and students will utilize alternative methods such as assessment chores, lessons and cap-stone projects to demonstrate mastery of college and career standards.

The applicant describes the expansion of learning resources, instructional practices and additional teacher training to ensure full accessibility by students with disabilities and English language learners.

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	0
--	----	---

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

It was not evident that the applicant addressed this item in its application.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	6
(E)(1) Reviewer Comments: The applicant described how it will continue to make improvements and reporting outcomes to the public. But, the applicant did not provide sufficient evidence to indicate a thoughtful strategy for implementing a rigorous continuous improvement process of its plan. In addition, the applicant does not describe the sharing of information on the quality of its investments with the public.		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	5
(E)(2) Reviewer Comments: The applicant provided a detailed approach in its strategy for ongoing communications with its external and internal stakeholders through annual meetings with the school board, quarterly meetings with the leadership team and the establishment of a communications plan. The applicant provides further evidence of the strategy it is undertaking through the activities, deliverables and timelines provided in its chart that further ongoing communications with various stakeholders.		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	2
(E)(3) Reviewer Comments: The applicant provided the requisite number of performance measures. But, based on the data provided in the chart, the applicant did not demonstrate that the measures were ambitious in some instances such as moving up one percentage point per year when achievement levels are already low for some of its subgroups. The applicant did not provide a narrative to describe the rationale for selecting the performance measures provided in the chart, how the measures would provide rigorous, timely, and formative leading information tailored to its plan, or how it would improve measures over time.		
(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	5
(E)(4) Reviewer Comments: The applicant has provided a strong approach in evaluating the effectiveness of its CARPE DIEM project by contracting with an outside third-party consultant that will be provided a list of criterion and timeline for deliverables as listed in the chart provided and an analysis of quantitative and qualitative data. The applicant further provides evidence of its effectiveness in evaluating its project through the detailed matrix it will use throughout the grant period to determine if the project is effective.		

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	6
(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: The applicant described in its narrative that it will use other funding sources but did not indicate the dollar amount that it will provide toward supporting this project. The applicant does provide a budget that is reasonable but may not be sufficient to support the project since dollar amounts for outside sources were not provided. The applicant does provide a clear rationale for each funding category it listed and identified that equipment and supplies would be one-time investments. However, the applicant will not identify funds for ongoing operational costs until it receives funding and conducts an analysis.		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	2
(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: The applicant does not provide a high-quality plan for sustainability. Instead, the applicant describes an analysis that it will conduct after it receives funding to establish a fiscal program model that will be used to develop a sustainability plan. The applicant did not provide other sources of funds it would use to sustain the project after the grant period.		

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	7
<p>Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant has met the competitive preference priority. The applicant provided detailed evidence to support the ongoing community partnership it already has in place with Kent County through its Family and Children's Coordinating Council, and the applicant has identified the district within the consortium that will take the lead and the results it wants to achieve through the funding of this project which will assist the applicant in providing additional student and family supports to address the social, emotional, or behavioral needs of its students.</p> <p>The applicant has provided the evidence of a successful program it already has in place with outside health providers through the Kent School Services Network and has identified eight desired results that include both educational results and other education outcomes which will be tracked at the individual school building level.</p>		

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met
<p>Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant has addressed the project it intends to implement – CARPE DIEM in a comprehensive manner and has identified the issues affecting the student population it has targeted which is moving from an industrial community to a technological community through the establishment of skill sets provided through individualized personal learning strategies.</p>		

Total	210	132
-------	-----	-----

Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)

	Available	Score
Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)	15	2
<p>Optional Budget Supplement Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provided a supplement budget to expand its project to reach additional high-need students. However, the applicant does not provide sufficient evidence to indicate how the applicant has a clear, discrete and innovative solution through this funding request. The applicant does not provide sufficient evidence on the rationale for the high-need student population that it will address. The applicant does not provide a high-quality plan or the reasonableness of the costs and the impact the funding of the items listed would have on its students.</p>		

Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0962MI-3 for Wyoming Public Schools



A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant describes a clear reform vision for students and teachers grades 5-12. The application presents a dramatic shift in pedagogy from memorization to a culture of critical thinking and deep understanding by creating Personalized Learning Environments described as cutting-edge, technology-enabled and competency-based. The strength of the application is found in the infrastructure that supports the core educational assurances.</p> <p>The applicant describes how the project meets the four core educational assurances. 1. Common core standards and assessments have been adopted by the state and by the four participating districts. Alignment of curriculum and assessments to the common core standards is a project objective. ACT, EXPLORE and PLAN assessments are adopted by the districts. Professional development for teachers is planned to help them use the tools, technology and resources to ensure student readiness for college/careers. 2. Data systems to inform instruction are in place but underutilized. The project will bring together the assessment data with formative measures, something that has not happened in the past. Teachers will learn to analyze student data to build personalized student plans and measure their effectiveness. A plan is in place to use IGOR (Information Gathering to Obtain Results) to consolidate student data from various systems. 3. Professional development for teachers is recognized as a critical part of the plan to deepen and personalize learning and is the plan for transforming lowest-achieving schools.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The choice of participating schools is justified by an examination of shared needs, student demographics, risk factors and geographic propensity. Further justification is supported by data obtained from a partner profile tool. The application includes a list of the participating schools, number of participating students, number of participating students from low-income families, number of high need students and number of participating educators.</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	6
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant did an exceptional job of condensing the reform vision into a scalable model as a continuous portable process, supported by a clear and understandable Logic Model. The applicant did not describe plans to scale up beyond participating schools.</p>		
(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	9
<p>(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The reform vision is highly likely to result in improved student learning and increased equity. The plan for improved student outcomes shows that, over the course of the grant, measurable student gains are achievable and would include improved student performance and reduce sub-group inequities. Charts presented include 6th-12th grade summative assessments, achievement gaps by sub-group, graduation rates, college enrollment and college degree attainment.</p> <p>The baseline data and target goals are confusing and no explanation is provided.</p>		

B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	2
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The application makes a weak case in presenting a record of success. The data presented demonstrates the need for reform and school improvement by the state ranking of the participating schools.</p> <p>No evidence is presented that demonstrates a four-year record of success.</p> <p>No student outcome data is presented.</p> <p>One school made significant progress as measured by the state ranking system (from 9th from the bottom in 2010 to 63rd in 2012) and progress is attributed to a federal school improvement grant.</p> <p>Student performance data is not mentioned in this section; neither is there a description of how data is available to students, educators or parents.</p>		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	5
<p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>There is a high level of transparency in the district. There is compliance with the state requirements for schools and districts to post actual personnel salaries and other expenditures on their respective websites and to keep paper copies for ten years. In addition to the minimum requirements, the district provides a dashboard (report card) to all parents with financial information plus student performance information, graduation rates, class size and college readiness information.</p>		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	10
<p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>There is a high level of autonomy and successful conditions under state legal, statutory and regulatory requirements to implement the applicant's plan as evidenced by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • enactment of state legislation allowing seat time waivers for online learning • state legislation that extend policies and procedures expanding early college option to 9th graders • a state transformational model that supports the individualized learning approach • a reform vision and plan aligned with state reforms 		
(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	10
<p>(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>A broad group of stakeholders including the collective bargaining representative were highly engaged in the development and review of the proposal as demonstrated by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • planning sessions • community meetings • presentations • surveys <p>An extensive number of letters of support from a wide range of stakeholders is included in the Appendix.</p>		
(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	5
<p>(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant presents a thorough analysis of the current status of the proposed program components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • well-articulated needs and gaps • charts that indicate levels of poverty, racial distribution, district ACT scores and benchmarks, 5th grade math and 		

- reading proficiency, 11th grade proficiency scores and numbers of homeless students
- a comprehensive chart indicating the current status of implementation of program components including the status of technologies, college- and career-readiness, personalized learning environments and teacher leaders

The applicant's logic and rationale behind the proposal is well supported:

- adoption of personalized learning philosophy based on research-based pedagogy (Universal Design for Learning)
- foundational principles that give student an active voice in learning and demonstrating competency

C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	13
<p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>This is an adequate overall plan with areas of robust substance and areas that could be more clearly defined. This is evidenced by strong and convincing plans for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> an integrated, web-based assessment, planning and portfolio system for students a plan to deeply utilize student data from EXPLORE, PLAN and ACT assessments a plan for redesigned instruction leveraging technology and personalized by curriculum workgroups <p>Less clear are plans that lead to student-driven mastery of rigorous content outside the classroom by extending time and place access to internet-based content. Motivation for students to pursue independent studies is not provided. Similarly, plans to develop an understanding of diverse cultures and perspectives hinges on student-led, global connections through the internet alone, and vague plans to incorporate service learning and community service. There is an assumption that project-based learning will develop skills in goal-setting, teamwork, perseverance, critical thinking, communication, creativity, and problem-solving, but again the description is lacking in detail.</p> <p>The applicant does not present a cohesive, project-wide strategy for a sequence of individual student achievement. Beyond the adoption of Common Core standards, participating districts are continuing their own structures and supports for personalizing learning environments. There is a list of strategies, by school district, that describes existing programs; evidence is not presented that these individual strategies are impacting student performance.</p> <p>At this point in the proposal, there is a shift from disconnected district plans to more focused strategies to provide all teachers with resources and high-quality content aligned to college- and career-readiness. Solid strategies are in place or envisioned to provide all students access to content through a wide variety of instructional methods and platforms. A strong component of the plan is a rubric for evaluating high-quality content in each of the subject areas, its accompanying teacher resources and how it is aligned with college- and career-readiness. Also in place is PLTW which has shown evidence of improving student performance, engagement and achievement.</p> <p>The plan to use assessment data sets through IGOR, the state's student data warehousing system, is an excellent plan that supports student/parent and educator use of data. One caveat is the statement that describes the manual input of data by teachers and principals between the source systems and IGOR, not maximizing the potential of available data integration and increasing the potential of inconsistencies in data.</p> <p>.</p>		
(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	20
<p>(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>This is an very strong and promising plan for helping educators improve instruction and increase their capacity to support student progress toward college- and career-ready readiness by implementating personalized learning and teaching for all students.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a cohort of 51 identified middle and high school leaders will embark upon a four-year journey of professional development in a coaching model provided by the College Acceleration Network cohort model will help ensure district-wide implementation all teachers will be offered significant hours of training and provided coaching in data analysis, personalized learning, use of technologies and leadership 		

- professional communities are established to deepen knowledge and skills and increase individual and collective capacity
- training supports the use of tools, resources and assessments for meeting student needs
- teacher and principal evaluation frameworks are in place to annually assess effectiveness and evidence of student learning
- consistent framework for continuous improvement

The plan to increase the number of students receiving instruction from highly effective teachers is evidenced by the annual performance measure targets and by the annual goals for decreasing achievement gaps.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	14
(D)(1) Reviewer Comments: Personalized learning is well supported by policies and infrastructures that were examined for possible barriers to implementation. From the perspective of the central office, policies are largely described in terms of fiscal management and administration and are well aligned with procurement standards. At the school level, policies allow autonomy and flexibility, within the constricts of contractual guidelines. Contractual guidelines may prove to be a problem. The are no policies or rules that would restrict mastery learning demonstration. Special education teachers and experts provided recommendations and suggestions to ensure the expanded learning resources and practices included adaptations for students with disabilities and English language learners.		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	0
(D)(2) Reviewer Comments: The applicant did not address this criteria.		

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	8
(E)(1) Reviewer Comments: The plan for continuous improvement is strong in its varied and frequent collection of data through site visits, surveys and collection of data and documents of student progress and achievement. The plan assumes success and looks to the continuous improvement process for validation. Missing from the plan are strategies or plans to use the data and information to makes changes, improvements or corrections along the way.		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	5
(E)(2) Reviewer Comments: Ongoing communiciation plans are well-articulated with mechanisms for both outgoing and incoming information sharing. The strength of the communication plan is found in two areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a calendar of monthly or quarterly reports to or meetings with stakeholders • a plan for revising project components based on stakeholder feedback 		

(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	4
<p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Performance measures are adequate although not ambitious. Performance measures are aligned with the overall goals of the project.</p> <p>Twelve performance measures are included with annual targets for all participating students including students with disabilities and English language learners. Baseline and target data are provided for numbers of students with highly effective teachers and principals. The performance measure for effective teachers and principals is not included.</p> <p>Performance measures include both academic and social-emotional indicators. The rationale for selection of each of the measures is not provided. A review of the effectiveness of the performance measure is not discussed.</p> <p>Data from performance measures will be part of the data analyses done by teachers, school leaders and evaluator.</p>		
(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	4
<p>(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Evaluation is focused on the goals, objective and activities described in the reform plan. It is an adequate plan using descriptive and regression-based evaluative techniques. A strong component of the plan is the inclusion of the evaluator as part of the project team. Frequent feedback, described in the evaluation plan, may serve to strengthen the overall plan for continuous improvement.</p>		

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score	
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	6	
(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:			
The budget supports the project narrative and is reasonable and sufficient for project implementation.			
No other funds to support the project are included in the budget. One-time expenditures are noted in the budget narrative. A clear rationale is provided in the narrative sections of the application and reiterated in the budget narrative.			
Serious discrepancies are found in the calculations.			
Section	Budget Sum	Narrative	Difference
1	0	0	0
2	0	0	0
3	0	0	0
4	237,000	237,000	0
5	1,634,440	1,130,360	-504,080
6	5,642,710	6,155,790	513,080
7	12,846,149	9,928,299	-2,917,850
8		0	0
	20,360,299	17,451,449	-2,908,850

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	7
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>There is a reasonable sustainability plan. A more substantial and specific plan for sustainability is scheduled to be developed in the first year of the project.</p> <p>While the plan for sustainability does not include a post-grant budget, it is clear that much thought has gone into forecasting future costs and the need to identify funds that might be reallocated or new sources of funding. Collaborative planning with accounting staff and the technology provider will take place in year 1. Annual budget reviews are slated to identify areas of fund reallocation.</p>		

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	7
<p>Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>This is a strong plan to address health, mental health and family stability issues in partnership with Kent School Services Network (KSSN).</p> <p>Grant funds will provide 8 Community School Coordinators to increase access to health and human services at schools, and to connect families with a wide range of services, community organizations and other resources for targeted supports based on family and student needs, 8 Clinicians for child-centered and family focused services and 4 nurses for school-based medical services. Needs assessments, data collection, monthly reporting and communication among partners are all part of the plan.</p> <p>Performance measures are listed but they do not have annual targets or a description of desired results for students.</p>		

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met
<p>Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant meets the Absolute Priority 1 by describing in the narrative its plan to build on the four core assurances areas and meet the criteria set forth in the competition.</p>		

Total	210	155
-------	-----	-----

Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)

	Available	Score
Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)	15	4
<p>Optional Budget Supplement Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant proposes the purchase of 1:1 devices for math and science classrooms and 45 Creation Stations.</p> <p>There is no plan presented for the targeted population of users, rationale, proposed use and benefits, or associated activities.</p>		



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0962MI-4 for Wyoming Public Schools

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	7
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant has described a coherent vision of reform that addresses each of the four core assurance areas. It will use lessons learned in its state's Race to the Top proposal process to deepen student learning through the use of technology. The applicant speaks to the acceleration of student learning by the implementation of innovative practices learned through professional development. Systems such as IGOR will provide a data warehouse to allow for personalized learning. However, the applicant does not provide enough details to describe types of technology that will deepen learning, promising innovative practices that accelerate learning, or uses of the data warehouse to personalize learning.</p> <p>Because the applicant sets forth a vision that is coherent, but is not comprehensive, this criterion is scored medium.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provides a coherent rationale for the selection of schools in the project, with a focus on the inclusion of high need students. It will effectively use a partnership of its LEAs to produce high-quality LEA-level implementation of the proposal. Principals and other school leaders will be trained so that professional learning communities will cause a thorough school-level implementation as well. The proposal has a table that lists the schools along with their demographic information. There are eleven schools in the project serving grades 5 to 12. This totals about five thousand one hundred students, seventy-eight percent of whom are economically disadvantaged, as well as more than three hundred teachers and fifty education leaders. The applicant meets the minimum participation requirements of the grant.</p> <p>Because the applicant meets all of the requirements of this criterion, it is scored in the high range.</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	4
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant has provided a logic model in section A3, which illustrates how inputs (activities) lead to outputs, along with short and long-term outcomes of the grant proposal. Elements for planning and implementation are also given.</p> <p>No evidence is given for scale-up, and elements of a high quality plan for reform, such as timelines and responsible parties, are missing.</p> <p>Because the applicant provides evidence for some of the components of a high quality plan, but scale up is not addressed, this area is ranked medium.</p>		
(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	3
<p>(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provides baselines and annual goals for all participating students on state summative assessments in mathematics and reading for grades 6, 7, 8 and 11, and for science in grades 8 and 11. Baselines and annual goals are included for PLAN, EXPLORE, and ACT. No details are given by LEA or by school. No evidence is given that the goals are equal to or exceed the state targets.</p> <p>Baselines are given for all students, by gender, ethnicities and LEP status in the table related to gaps. Also provided are goals to close achievement gaps compared to White students. However, the White category is often higher in the baseline time period than its goal in the first year of the grant. No discussion is given how targets were determined. Because of this anomaly, the goals cannot be considered ambitious. No explanation is provided in the methodology section demonstrating</p>		

that these goals are achievable.

The applicant includes a table on high school graduation goals for all students, by gender, ethnicities and LEP status. In this table as well there are categories that are higher in the baseline time period than the goal in the first year of the grant. The college enrollment table lists only all students summed over four LEAs. The applicant does give a postsecondary degree table for one high school.

Because the applicant has addressed these sections of the criterion only partially, fails to provide data by LEA, and does not give an explanation for its targets, this criterion was ranked medium.

B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	3
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provides narrative evidence that one LEA has improved a low performing schools; no evidence is provided for the other three LEAs.</p> <p>A top-to-bottom chart is given as evidence for high school improvement. However, one school's ranking constantly increases, another's rank decreases, and three others increase in rank and then decrease.</p> <p>The applicant has shown progress in increasing ACT benchmark success, but this is only 0.7% over the last year.</p> <p>No evidence is provided that the LEA has closed achievement gaps. The applicant notes that one of the largest gaps is that of the category of special education to White students. However, this group was not included for analysis or targeted for interventions in the discussion on achievement gaps in A4b.</p> <p>The applicant does not provide evidence for a record of success overall, which results in this criterion ranking as low.</p>		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	3
<p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The district exceeds all state requirements for transparency. Personnel salaries for teachers and staff must be reported. The applicant notes that these are reported in the aggregate. By state law, school and district budgets must be posted on the district website.</p> <p>However, the applicant LEAs do not post salary information by campus, but for the district as a whole. Actual personnel salaries are not reported at the school level for instructional staff, teachers, or support staff. Non-personnel expenditures are posted on the website.</p> <p>Because the applicant does not post personnel salaries by the four categories in the criterion, and is limited to district level information, this criterion was marked in the medium range.</p>		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	8
<p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The LEA has begun work to personalize learning under the adopted Common Core Standards and the use of EXPLORE, PLAN and ACT. The state has allowed autonomy by granting seat time waivers, which the district will use to provide online instruction. The state has also added additional operational flexibility in recent year. No evidence is presented that the applicant has enjoyed more success due to these now favorable conditions.</p> <p>Because the LEA has provided evidence that it has some autonomy and favorable conditions exist to implement personalized learning, this criterion was ranked high.</p>		
(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	8
<p>(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The proposal includes a table as evidence for community engagement and feedback. A study was conducted of community</p>		

members, parents, and staff, which led to the project design.

The applicant provides letters of support from local and state representatives, each LEA, local parent organizations, chamber of commerce, and community members. The application was signed by the local teacher union representative, and letters of support by teacher organizations are provided. The Memorandum of Understanding is included in the application. No letters of support demonstrate student input.

The applicant provides ample evidence of stakeholder engagement, with the exception of student involvement, and thus this area was ranked high.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)

5

3

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant demonstrated the logic behind its needs analysis portion of its plan to personalize learning. The analysis of the current status includes all of the features of a high quality plan. Timelines and activities associated with each of the goals related to needs by campus are described in this section. Responsible parties and deliverables are also given. The applicant makes a case for personalization so that each LEA improves in technology, personalized learning environments, and college and career readiness. Identified needs are addressed in the plan.

However, the applicant failed to link this section to the previous gap analysis in section A. The charts in this section reflect the general needs of the population, and do not focus on the gaps in achievement of high need students, who are also the targets of the plan.

Because the application contains the elements of a high quality plan to address needs, but is not clear about addressing gaps, this criterion was ranked medium.

C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	14
<p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provides some excellent evidence that students and teachers will utilize technology to impact learning. Teachers will have each student use online tools to personalize learning, including portfolios. Teachers will use technology to deepen student learning. Multiple models of technologies will be offered such as hybrid classes, blended learning, streaming, and STEM based curriculum. Learning will be deepened through service learning projects, internships, and project-based learning that will develop traits such as teamwork and exposure to diversity. PLAN, EXPLORE, and ACT will be used to guide college and career readiness. Parents will benefit from this planning process.</p> <p>Each LEA describes how it will personalize instruction for its students, with a variety of instructional approaches and high quality content, including Project Lead the Way.</p> <p>Although the applicant provides evidence that most students will utilize technology to improve learning, it does not provide evidence that students with the greatest needs will benefit, which weakened its technology plan. Ongoing and regular feedback will be provided to students via the IGOR data system; however, no specific analysis tools are provided that target high need students. Students will be provided tools such as the student orientation class to give them access and support them in managing their own learning, but no accommodations are mentioned for high need students or training for parents in these tools. The applicant is not clear about how it will implement additional aid to students of greatest need. Thirty-five prototype classrooms across the four districts will have \$15,000 in computer equipment to use in classes with high need students. However, no decision-making process is given to determine which schools and which students will be the beneficiaries.</p> <p>Overall, the applicant has produced a plan with some of the high quality elements necessary for a successful plan: goals, activities, resources, deliverables and responsible campuses. It does not contain timelines. In addition, there is no clear link between each deliverable and the person responsible.</p> <p>Because the project has some elements of a high quality plan, but does not address fully the involvement of parents or high need students, this criterion was marked medium.</p>		
(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	12

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has successfully made a case for its high quality plan of faculty development, by including goals, activities, timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties by adopting the College Acceleration Network (CAN) plan for school leaders. It envisions training all of the participating school leaders in its methods and supports them through its four core services of leadership, intervention, assessment, and partnerships. Leadership relates to goals, strategies and reporting. Response to Intervention is a major part of the CAN plan. It also includes forming partnerships with postsecondary institutions. As part of a phase in process, the principals involve teachers in this professional development. Instructional coaching will also improve teaching in the CAN method. Teachers will be trained to use the IGOR system, and will eventually join the professional learning communities in the CAN process. However, the plan needs more details about how and when the applicant will incorporate teachers into the professional development plan.

The applicant provided strong evidence for its use of student data in the annual teacher evaluation. In contrast, no evidence is given relating to use of this data in principal evaluation. In addition, the applicant fails to provide evidence of a plan to increase the number of students receiving instruction from highly effective teachers and principals. These omissions weakened the faculty development plan presented by the applicant.

Because of the extensive professional development for leaders, but only some details about training for teachers, this area was ranked medium.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	10
<p>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant has provided only some evidence of sufficient structural support in order to make the plan a success.</p> <p>There were two areas that were addressed well by the applicant. Seat-time waivers and on-line learning such as portfolios are in place that allow students to progress based on mastery in multiple ways. Also, the applicant has contemplated materials for special needs students and accessing dual language content providers for English language learners.</p> <p>In contrast, there were three weaknesses in the plan due to the policies and infrastructure of the applicant. The four LEAs do not provide evidence that the structure of each LEA has been adjusted for the purpose of this project. However, this weakness is attenuated somewhat by the appointment of a lead LEA that will direct the project. Second, on each campus, it is not clear who has ultimate authority in a school in the cross-reporting relationship proposed. Third, the project directors will have to comply with multiple requirements of the state; the applicant does not address flexibility or autonomy for these leaders.</p> <p>As the applicant provides only some evidence that it has met this criterion, it is ranked medium.</p>		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	1
<p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant has omitted this section in the proposal. No portion of the application addresses ensuring that all stakeholders have access, open data or interoperability.</p> <p>The applicant addresses technical support in general.</p> <p>Because of the lack of data, this area was judged low.</p>		

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	8
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant makes a strong case for its continuous improvement process implementation, as it reports that continuous</p>		

improvement processes are already in place in member LEAs. For this project, the project director will drive the continuous improvement process, with reporting from project evaluators. Data will be collected each year to measure teacher and administrator buy-in for the project, including surveys and site visits. The applicant gives evidence that it will give project reports to community stakeholders via newsletters, websites, and board meetings on a regular basis. Thus, the applicant will monitor, measure, and share information about the status of the project.

However, the lack of evidence of how these reports will inform the continuous improvement process weakens the proposal. Details are not provided as to how these reports generate improvements in the project. It is also unclear if continuous improvement practices will continue after the life of the grant.

Because the applicant has provided evidence for the some of the sections of this criterion, but does not establish a rigorous improvement process, it has been ranked medium.

(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)

5

5

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides evidence that it will continue to communicate with internal and external stakeholders through board meetings, newsletters, and district webpages. A table is provided with communication tasks, reports, and timeframes.

Because the applicant fully meets this criterion, it was scored in the high range.

(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)

5

1

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Section E3 indicates the number of students with highly effective teachers and principals, reaching 18% of high school students by 2016-17. More students need to be impacted by highly effective teachers in order for this goal to be considered ambitious. In contrast, the FAFSA participation goal is to increase to 85% by 2016-17.

The applicant has provided evidence that it will monitor the all students category in reading and math for grades 6 to 8. These increase about three percent per year. For college readiness, students who are on track in middle school will increase from two percent to six percent over the life of the grant. Middle school discipline goals are included, as well as student attendance goals. These improve about two percent per year. ACT scores for 11th graders will include the subgroups of English language learners and special education students. College readiness in all ACT subjects will increase by one percent a year to reach six percent after the grant. An improvement of two percent per year is not reflective of ambitious improvement.

Because of the targets are not ambitious or rigorous in this area, this criterion is ranked low.

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)

5

5

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has provided a high quality framework to evaluate the effectiveness of the plan, which will be measured by an outside evaluator.

It includes timelines, key evaluation events, responsible parties, activities, outputs, data sources, and evaluation strategies. The evaluator will give annual reports disseminated throughout the LEAs, in addition to a final report. Part of the evaluation also includes an assessment of how the applicant has used time, staff and money in its efforts to achieve improved results.

Because the applicant provides for a high quality plan to evaluate the project, this area is rated in the high range.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	5
(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
The applicant identifies the funds that are one-time investments, such as the evaluation of the project and the purchase of technology. No funds other than Race to the Top-District grant monies will be used to support the project. No letters of support indicate that other funds will be raised for this project.		

Most of the costs for the Kent Services Network, Continuous Improvement, STEM partnerships, and CARPE DIEM are reasonable and sufficient to successfully complete the project. However, purchases of technology equipment fit better under Equipment rather than in the category of Other. The cost of the STEM lab classroom is given as \$15,000 in the narrative, but a prototype classroom in the budget section is \$35,000. There is no comparison of the two in the proposal. More details need to be provided for the category of tools and curriculum, as it is a purchase of \$5.3 million.

Because the applicant does not provide a thorough description of how technology funds will be used for the project, this area was scored medium.

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	3
--	----	---

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant states that local funds will be used beyond the life of the grant to sustain the work, but no details of sources of these funds are given.

A large portion of the budget is contractual, but this is used to hire personnel. No plans are included regarding how the applicant will fund these positions after the life of the grant.

The applicant does not include timelines or responsible parties in its plan for sustainability. However, the applicant does plan to review the budget process each year. No letters of support from government leaders indicate financial support.

Because the applicant fails to provide evidence for a high quality plan, this criteria is marked medium.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	8

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

This competitive preference is in the area of mental health, where the LEA has an existing partner, KSSN. There has been success in scaling up projects in the past.

No financial support in cash or in-kind from partners are included in the budget. The applicant has letters of support from partner organizations and community members in the application.

The applicant has listed eight goals that relate to mental health, and describes how it would track indicators related to these goals. Program evaluation will be conducted every year by the district via surveys in order to improve results. The professional learning communities of staff formed in the partnership will assess the needs of students and community, implement and evaluate supports for these students, and use a cycle of continuous improvement to monitor progress. Monthly meetings, which will include parent input, will be led by the principals to assess needs. Although specific measures are lacking, annual performance indicators are given.

Because of the evidence provided by the applicant that it has coherent and sustainable partnerships with the local organization, can track data and improve results over time, as well as build capacity of staff, this criterion was marked in the high range.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Not Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides some evidence that it will improve teaching through professional development, which will focus on the personalization of learning for students. It provides ample evidence that school leaders will be impacted through the CAN plan.

Technology will be used to deepen student learning and meet the individual needs of most students. Accommodations and

supports are lacking for high need students. The emphasis on data and monitoring will increase attendance, achievement, and graduation rates.

However, the process at which students will have access to the most effective teachers and principals, who will help them graduate from high school prepared for college is not ambitious for some schools. Learning targets, though achievable, are not ambitious.

Because the the applicant has not comprehensively addressed how it will significantly improve learning, absolute priority one is not met.

Total	210	121
-------	-----	-----

Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)

	Available	Score
Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)	15	3

Optional Budget Supplement Reviewer Comments:

The application includes one optional area: one to one devices. This is merely an extension of the main proposal.

This optional section only includes a budget section. It does not include a description, goals, activities, timeline, responsible parties, or deliverables. The optional plan does not indicate if it includes two LEAs.

The costs appear reasonable in relation to the objectives of the project and the number of teachers served. However, no rationale is included that illustrates which schools and teachers will receive these additional resources.

Because of its omissions, this criterion was rated low.